

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks made herein.

Claims 1, 4-7, and 9 are pending and stand rejected.

Claims 1, 4-5 and 9 stand objected to because of informalities. Claims 1, 4-5 and 9 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request removal of these objections.

Claims 1 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that "wherein the subscriber terminal is configured to request, from an authorization server using the internet protocol gateway, one or more of a plurality of services, the authorization server configured to check the entitlement of the subscriber to the one or more of a plurality of services to

be provided by the information server, and the authorization server is configured to enable the subscriber to access said one or more plurality of services, wherein each requested service can be authorized separately and can be rendered concurrently by the subscriber terminal." Support for this amendment can be found, inter alia, on page 2, lines 7-12 of the specification.

With the amendments noted above, applicant believes that the reason for the examiner's rejection has been overcome. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4-7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Pinder et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,105,134).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and explicitly traverses, the examiner's reason for rejecting the claims.

Claim 1, as amended, recites;

1. A broadcast network comprising:
 - an information server coupled to an internet protocol gateway;
 - a plurality of subscriber terminals coupled to the internet protocol gateway, the subscriber terminals for receiving broadcast signals from the information server;
 - a return channel for transmitting information from a subscriber terminal to a head-end;
 - authentication means coupled to an internet protocol gateway, the authentication means for authorizing the access of the subscriber terminal to interactive services,
 - wherein the subscriber terminal is configured to request, from an authorization server using the internet protocol gateway, one or more of a plurality of services, the authorization server configured to check the entitlement of the subscriber to the one or more of a plurality of services to be provided by the information server, and the authorization server is configured to enable the subscriber to access said one or more plurality of services, wherein each requested service can be authorized separately and can be rendered concurrently by the subscriber terminal.

Pinder teaches techniques for secure transmission of messages via a reverse path wherein a portion, e.g. the beginning of an event, is broadcast generally and customers can decide whether they want to see all of it. If so, a key 420 is generated and sent to an entitlement agent (See col. 12, line 47 through col. 13, line 15). Applicants can find nothing in Pinder that describes, teaches or implies the limitations of: "...wherein each requested service can be authorized separately and can be rendered concurrently by the subscriber terminal" as claimed in claim 1. Independent claims 5-7 recite similar limitations.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. Pinder cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, because Pinder fails to disclose each and every element recited.

Having shown that Pinder fails to disclose each and every element claimed, applicant submits that the reason for the examiner's rejection of the claim has been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully

requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

With regard to claims 4 and 9, these claims depend from an independent claim discussed above, which have been shown to be allowable in view of the cited reference. Accordingly, each of claims 4 and 9 is also allowable by virtue of its dependence from an allowable base claim.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski
Registration No. 42,079



By: Thomas Onka
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,053

Date: June 10, 2006

Mail all correspondence to:
Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615